



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/873,183	06/05/2001	Shell S. Simpson	10005668-1	5716

7590 11/15/2004
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

LIN, KENNY S

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2154

DATE MAILED: 11/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<p align="center">Office Action Summary</p>	Application No. 09/873,183	Applicant(s) SIMPSON ET AL.	
	Examiner Kenny Lin	Art Unit 2154	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 June 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-22 are presented for examination.

Specification

2. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

3. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it fails to fall within the range of 50 to 150 words. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipate by Plakosh et al (Plakosh), US 5,825,991.

Art Unit: 2154

6. As per claim 1, Plakosh taught the claimed invention including an apparatus that controls tasks in a multi-tasking computer network, comprising:

- a. A job ticket service (fig.1, 104; col.3, lines 41-43, 57-60), comprising:
 - i. A job ticket reference service (fig.1, 106), wherein a reference to a job ticket is maintained (col.3, lines 57-65); and
 - ii. A service bus coupled to the job ticket service (fig.1, 102), wherein the service bus receives job tickets and transmits the job ticket to the job ticket service (col.3, lines 41-43).

7. Claims 1-7, 9-16 and 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipate by Kovant et al (Kovant), US 5,619,649.

8. As per claim 1, Kovant taught the claimed invention including an apparatus that controls tasks in a multi-tasking computer network, comprising:

- a. A job ticket service (fig.16, 404; col.15, lines 44-45, 50-53), comprising:
 - i. A job ticket reference service (fig.15, 416), wherein a reference to a job ticket is maintained (col.16, lines 9-15); and
 - ii. A service bus coupled to the job ticket service (fig.15, 426), wherein the service bus receives job tickets and transmits the job ticket to the job ticket service (col.15, lines 39-43, col.16, lines 9-15, 22-26).

Art Unit: 2154

9. As per claim 9, Kovant taught the claimed invention including a digital work flow network, comprising:

- a. A service bus that provides access to job content and corresponding job tickets (fig.16, 426; col.16, lines 47-54);
- b. A job ticket service that stores the job tickets and creates references to the job tickets (fig.15, 416; col.16, lines 9-15, 22-26); and
- c. A plurality of users that access the job content and the corresponding job tickets, wherein access to a job ticket is controlled by a corresponding job ticket reference (col.16, lines 47-57).

10. As per claim 13, Kovant taught the claimed invention including a method for controlling tasks in a multi-tasking network, comprising:

- a. Receiving a job ticket at a job ticket service (col.16, lines 9-15, 19-26);
- b. Creating a reference to the job ticket service (col.16, lines 9-15, 22-26);
- c. Storing the job ticket reference (col.16, lines 9-15, 22-26).

11. As per claim 21, Kovant taught the claimed invention including a job ticket server, comprising:

- a. A job ticket reference capable of maintaining a reference to a job ticket (col.16, lines 9-15);
- b. A job ticket store capable of storing the job ticket and the reference to the job ticket (fig.15, 416; col.16, 9-15, 22-26); and

Art Unit: 2154

- c. A job ticket controller (fig.15, 418; col.15, lines 48-50), wherein the job ticket controller is capable of providing the job ticket reference to one or more processors using the job ticket service (fig.18; col.15, lines 48-50, col.16, lines 45-64; job ticket reference is inherently provided in the directory).

12. As per claim 22, Kovant taught the claimed invention including a program storage device readable by a computer in a network, the program storage device tangibly embodying a program of instructions executable by the computer to perform method steps for controlling tasks in the network, the method steps, comprising:

- a. Receiving a job ticket at a job ticket service (col.16, lines 9-15, 19-26);
- b. Creating a reference to the job ticket (col.16, lines 9-15, 19-26);
- c. Storing the job ticket reference (col.16, lines 9-15, 19-26);
- d. Providing the job ticket reference to a processor in the network (col.16, lines 30-54); and
- e. Providing the processor with access to the job ticket based on the job ticket reference (col.16, lines 45-54).

13. As per claim 2, Kovant taught the invention claimed in claim 1. Kovant further taught the apparatus to comprise:

- a. A job ticket storage (fig.15, 410; col.15, lines 44-47); and
- b. A processor coupled to the service bus (fig.15, 400; col.15, lines 57-59), wherein the job ticket service stores the job tickets in the job ticket storage (col.16, lines 9-

15), wherein the job ticket service provides a job ticket reference corresponding to each of the stored job tickets (col.16, lines 9-15, 22-26), and wherein the processor accesses the job tickets to complete the tasks (col.16, lines 47-64, col.17, lines 3-17).

14. As per claim 3, Kovant taught the invention claimed in claim 2. Kovant further taught that the processor acquires the job ticket reference, and wherein the processor uses the job ticket reference to access the job ticket (col.16, lines 47-54).

15. As per claim 4, Kovant taught the invention claimed in claim 2. Kovant further taught that the job ticket service limits access to the job ticket to a portion of the job ticket (col.16, lines 47-55).

16. As per claim 5, Kovant taught the invention claimed in claim 2. Kovant further taught that the processor updates the job ticket, and the job ticket service stores the updated job ticket (col.16, lines 26-29).

17. As per claim 6, Kovant taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 2. Kovant further taught that multiple processors are coupled to the service bus (fig.1, 18, 20, fig.15, 400, 402, 404; col.16, lines 65-66), and wherein a first processor passes the job ticket reference to a second processor (from 404 to 400, col.16, lines 45-54), the second processor using the job ticket reference to access a portion of the job ticket (col.16, lines 45-55).

18. As per claim 7, Kovant taught the invention claimed in claim 1. Kovant further taught to comprise a job store that stores job content (fig.15, 417; col.15, lines 44-49), and wherein the job ticket comprises:

- a. A service identification that correlates the job ticket to the job ticket service (col.9, lines 22-26);
- b. A job identification that correlates the job ticket to the job content (col.16, lines 9-15, 31-54); and
- c. A control module that includes parameters that define processes required to complete a task (col.16, lines 55-67, col.17, lines 1-4, 12-13).

19. As per claim 10, Kovant taught the invention claimed in claim 9. Kovant further taught to comprise:

- a. A job store that stores the job content (fig.15, 417; col.15, lines 44-49); and
- b. A work flow controller that manages user access to the job tickets (col.16, lines 36-44; authentication is performed to manage user access permissions at the server. Work flow controller is inherently incorporated in the server in order to perform managements).

20. As per claim 11, Kovant taught the invention claimed in claim 9. Kovant further taught that the job ticket reference includes an identity of the job ticket and the job ticket service (col.9, lines 9-15, 22-26, 31-54).

21. As per claim 12, Kovant taught the invention claimed in claim 9. Kovant further taught that a user that accesses the job ticket processes a job content and updates information contain in the job ticket (col.16, lines 26-29, 47-60).

22. As per claim 14, Kovant taught the invention claimed in claim 13. Kovant further taught to comprise:

- a. Providing the job ticket reference to a processor in the network (col.16, lines 47-54); and
- b. Providing the processor with access to the job ticket based on the job ticket reference (col.16, lines 47-60).

23. As per claim 15, Kovant taught the invention claimed in claim 14. Kovant further taught that access to the job ticket is limited to a portion of the job ticket (col.16, lines 47-55).

24. As per claim 16, Kovant taught the invention claimed in claim 13. Kovant further taught to comprise:

- a. Receiving a job content corresponding to the job ticket (col.5, lines 14-16, col.17, lines 5-10);
- b. Storing the job content in the network (col.10, lines 17-18, col.17, lines 5-10); and
- c. Providing the processor access to the job content (col.16, lines 63-66, col.17, lines 3-17).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

25. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

26. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kovant et al (Kovant), US 5,619,649, in view of Morales, Jr. et al (Morales), US 6,687,834.

27. As per claim 8, Kovant taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1. Kovant did not specifically teach to comprise a work flow controller that coordinates completion of the task among one or more processors coupled to the service bus. Morales taught to include a work flow manager in managing the processes wherein when a process is completed, a report is being send to present the process result (col.3, lines 13-16). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Kovant, Ferlitsch and Morales because Morales' teaching of having a work flow manager generating a report to inform the result of the process enables the users of Kovant and Ferlitsch's method to know when the process of the job is completed.

28. Claims 17 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kovant et al (Kovant), US 5,619,649, in view of Ferlitsch et al (Ferlitsch), US 2002/0113989.

29. As per claim 17, Kovant taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 13.

Kovant further taught that the network comprises a plurality of processors (fig.1, 18, 20; col.16, lines 65-66), Kovant did not specifically teach the further comprised limitations claimed in claim 17. Ferlitsch taught a method for controlling task to assign job tasks assigned according to processor capacity, availability, speed or other attributes (pp. 0039, 0057) and select one or more of the plurality of processors to process the job ticket (pp. 0039, 0057).

30. It is obvious that the capability and availability information of each of the plurality of processors must first be obtained (e.g., received) in order to determine the assignment of processors in processing the jobs. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Kovant and Ferlitsch because Ferlitsch's teaching of assigning tasks according to the processor's ability enables Kovant's method to speed up task processing by distributing the tasks to suitable processors (pp. 0038-0039).

31. As per claim 20, Kovant and Ferlitsch taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 17. Kovant further taught that the selecting step is completed by an entity submitting the job ticket into the network (job description specifying the job as a printing job or a faxing job; col.17, lines 3-17).

Art Unit: 2154

32. Claims 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kovant et al (Kovant), US 5,619,649, and Ferlitsch et al (Ferlitsch), US 2002/0113989, as applied to claims 17 above, and further in view of Morales, Jr. et al (Morales), US 6,687,834.

33. As per claim 18, Kovant and Ferlitsch taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 17. Kovant and Ferlitsch did not specifically teach to comprise, when each processor of the selected one or more processors completes a process, receiving an update to information in the job ticket. Morales taught to include a work flow manager in managing the processes wherein when a process is completed, a report is being send to present the process result (col.3, lines 13-16). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Kovant, Ferlitsch and Morales because Morales' teaching of using a report to inform the result of the process enables the users of Kovant and Ferlitsch's method to know when the process of the job is completed.

34. As per claim 19, Kovant and Ferlitsch taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 17. Kovant and Ferlitsch did not specifically teach that the selecting step is completed by a work flow controller in the network. Morales taught a work flower manager to manage the processes and select processor for processing (col.3, lines 13-15). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Kovant, Ferlitsch and Morales because Morales' teaching of using a work flow manager in managing the selection of processors enables Kovant and Ferlitsch's method to select processors for processing when the processors are available.

Conclusion

35. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Neilsen, US 6,639,687.

Goertz et al, US 6,173,295.

Neuhard et al, US 6,335,795.

Van Der Linden et al, US 2001/0013947.

Yokoyama, US 2002/0174104.

Blumberg, US 6,708,309.

Lynch et al, US 6,581,097.

36. A shortened statutory period for reply to this Office action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action.

37. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kenny Lin whose telephone number is (571) 272-3968. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM to 5 PM Tue.-Fri. and every other Monday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2154

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ksl
November 9, 2004

Walter J. L.
11/10/04